

to congratulate him today on this great honor.

RECOGNITION OF THE UMD LADY BULLDOGS FOR WINNING THE 2003 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Minnesota in recognizing the University of Minnesota Duluth Women's Ice Hockey Team for winning their third straight national championship.

A Stanley Cup-winning professional hockey player said that "when you start a tournament, you stick with it." History has shown that the Lady Bulldogs maintain this same principle. In 2001 at the inaugural Frozen Four, they took on St. Lawrence University and won 4-2. The following year, they made it through the semifinals again, allowing them the opportunity to face Brown University, who they defeated 3-2 for their second title.

They entered this year's national tournament playing Dartmouth College in the semifinals, a game which was tied in the second period before UMD came back to win it 5-2.

Two days later, in the championship, they met No. 2 seeded Harvard University in what has been referred to by some as the best women's college hockey game ever.

Knowing what makes a good hockey game, I would have to agree. There was a near-capacity crowd; a first period ending score of 2-0, with Duluth in the lead; a solid return by Harvard in the second; and a scoreless first overtime, which resulted in a second where sophomore Nora Tallus scored the winning goal at 4 minutes and 19 seconds.

This goal concluded the 84-minute game, giving the Lady Bulldogs their third and probably most memorable title, as it was won at home in front of a near-capacity crowd at the Duluth Entertainment Convention Center.

I am pleased to stand here today, commending the UMD Women's Ice Hockey Team for winning the 2003 NCAA Division I National Collegiate Women's Ice Hockey Championship and recognizing the achievements of all the team's players, coaches, and staff.

THE POSTAL PENSION LIABILITY ACT, S. 380

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has taken action to pass S. 380, the Postal Pension Liability Act.

I would like to thank my colleagues on the Governmental Affairs Committee for their effort in getting this bill passed, particularly Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, chairman and ranking member, respectively, as well as Senator STEVENS and Senator CARPER, who have provided tremendous leadership in getting this bill through the Senate.

As my colleagues may know, the U.S. Postal Service, USPS, is required to pay into the Civil Service Retirement System, CSRS, an amount that equals the full cost of its obligation to CSRS. While the Postal Service has done so, the money it has placed into this account has earned interest at a higher rate than previously thought. Thus, the Office of Personnel Management estimated in November that the pension obligations for the USPS totaled \$5 billion and not a previously estimated \$32 billion.

This bill would correct the formula that overpays the Postal Service's obligation to the civil service retirement fund. In addition, this bill would stabilize postage rates through 2006 and help the Postal Service to pay down some of its debt. Stable postage rates will help keep shipping costs down as well as the indirect cost of all consumer goods.

Without this bill, the U.S. Postal Service would continue to overfund its contribution to the Civil Service Retirement System fund. If it had not been evaluated and corrected, the overpayment could have reached tens of billions of dollars in the decades ahead.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 380, I am pleased with the bipartisan manner in which the Senate has acted to pass this much-needed bill. This spirit of cooperation is truly in the best interest of the American people.

RETIRED OFFICERS' COMMENTARY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there has been much discussion here in the Senate and in the press about retired military officers who have been appearing in the media throughout the coverage of the diplomatic efforts and the actual military operations to end the global threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction.

My own opinion is that most of these retired officers have, in a very fair, constructive, helpful way, interpreted the complexity of modern military operations, the highly technical range of military equipment, and have conveyed their positive observations of the courage and professionalism of our men and women in uniform—from the generals to the privates.

In most presentations, these retired officers have shown professional responsibility and prudent restraint in giving their views and interpretations. But a few have added personal criticisms over the planning and execution of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Professionals in the military have devoted their careers to protecting our Constitutional freedoms. Among the most cherished of these is freedom of speech. But that freedom has its legal, as well as ethical, restraints, and requires the exercise of good judgment, common sense, and taking into account the likely impact of their criticisms on servicemen and their families.

By and large, the retired officers have, through their careers of

dedicated service, earned the admiration of the general public. Consequently, a special trust is accorded them by the families, the parents, the grandparents of those serving in uniform. Quite often, the families take to heart what they say, even more so than the views of others.

If retired officers have professional views and judgments at variance with the active duty chain of command, they are, like all Americans, free to speak their mind. But how to do it—publicly or privately?

They have ample opportunity to convey their views to their former colleagues—today's military commanders—through private channels, and I know many do so through a variety of forums and through personal communications. Before making critical public statements during the course of military operations, I hope they carefully consider the consequences of such statements and recall how they, and their families, felt about unexpected public criticism when they were in the "trenches of conflict."

The tradition followed by Presidents, especially in times of conflict, is a worthy precedent. A sitting President customarily receives the views of past Commanders in Chief by way of private communication rather than through the media.

Mr. President, I expressed these points to members of the media after a Capitol Hill meeting Tuesday evening with Secretary Rumsfeld and General Meyers, and I ask unanimous consent that the excerpted text of my remarks at that news conference, and those of the general, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM TRANSCRIPT, NEWS CONFERENCE WITH SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DONALD RUMSFELD; GENERAL RICHARD MYERS, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF; SENATOR JOHN WARNER (R-VA); REPRESENTATIVE DUNCAN HUNTER (R-CA)

Sen. WARNER.—We covered that very carefully. The general gave us a complete briefing. And I think, Duncan, I believe you will join with me, the consensus in our group just now is that a good plan has been in place, it is being executed. It is timely. Considerable progress has been made to date. And we see no reason at this time for anyone to be in criticism of this program.

And I want to talk a little bit about this retired military. I've been associated with the military a half-century or more. I think some of them have in a very constructive way interpreted the complexity of military operations today and the equipment, and I think they have done a good job in portraying the courage shown by the men and women who are executing this plan.

And if some have criticisms, we don't mean to stifle freedom of speech, but I think they should follow the tradition of President, the Commander in Chiefs. You do not see former Presidents criticizing a sitting President during a war. And in the same way, if they've got constructive criticism at variance with the plan, I think they should confidentially contact their own peers in the Pentagon and share it that way rather than open.